

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 27 2008

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/26401
Ref. No.: 1611REMARKSI. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 4-7, 12-15, 17, 19, 21-23, 25 and 28-35 have been amended. Claims 3, 18, 24 and 36-39 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-23 and 25-35 are now pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Specification stands objected to for not clearly defining which version of IEEE Standard 802.11 is incorporated by reference. (See 3/9/07 Office Action, p. 4.) This objection was reaffirmed in the Advisory Action. (See 3/25/08 Advisory Action, p. 2.) In view of the amendment to the Specification, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

III. OBJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)

The Amendment of December 15, 2006 stands objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) for introducing new matter into the disclosure. (See 3/9/07 Office Action, p. 4.) Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the amendment to paragraph [0016] introduces new matter by changing the definition of references to IEEE Standard 802.11. (See *id.*) In view of the above amendment to paragraph [0016], it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/26401
Ref. No.: 1611

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-9, 12-17 and 21-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. (See 3/9/07 Office Action, pp. 5-6.) Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the recited limitation “IEEE Standards 802.11a/b/g” is indefinite because the cited standards have been subject to revisions, and that it is unclear which version of the cited standards is referred to by the claims. (See id., p. 5.) Further, the Examiner asserted that the use of trademarks in the claim language is improper. (See id.) The Examiner reaffirmed these rejections in the Advisory Action. (See 3/25/08 Advisory Action, p. 2.) In view of the amendments to the claims, which remove the various recitations of IEEE standards, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections should be withdrawn.

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 18-23 and 25-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0135762 to Macaulay (hereinafter “Macaulay”) in view of U.S. Patent 7,042,852 to Hrastar (hereinafter “Hrastar”). (See 3/9/07 Office Action, pp. 6-9.) This rejection was reaffirmed in the Advisory Action. (See 3/25/08 Advisory Action, p. 2.)

Claim 1, as amended, recites “[i]n a wireless data communications system wherein mobile units communicate with a computer using access points, and wherein said system operates according to a protocol specifying a format for data message packets and said data message packets contain state information for said mobile units, a method for detecting unauthorized access attempts to the system, comprising: forwarding one or more data packets received by said access points to a computer; maintaining a state table on said computer, said state table storing state information for said mobile units, the state information including at least a MAC address parameter, an authentication status parameter, and a further parameter unrelated

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/26401
Ref. No.: 1611

to the MAC address parameter and the authentication status parameter; and operating said computer to compare format and state information of said one or more received data packets to selected requirements of said protocol-specified format and said stored state information, and signaling an alert if said packets deviate from said protocol-specified format or said stored state information.”

In view of the amendment to claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither Macaulay nor Hrastar discloses “maintaining a state table on said computer, said state table storing state information for said mobile units, the state information including at least a MAC address parameter, an authentication status parameter, and a further parameter unrelated to the MAC address parameter and the authentication status parameter,” as recited in claim 1. The Examiner concedes that Macaulay does not disclose maintaining a state table storing state information. (See 3/9/07 Office Action, p. 6.) Hrastar does not disclose the state table of claim 1 because the state data store of Hrastar only records “whether or not the device has been seen before and whether or not the station is unauthenticated and unassociated, authenticated, authenticated and associated, or unknown state information associated with the wireless computer network.” (Hrastar, col. 29, ll. 12-17.) None of the information in the state data store of Hrastar meets all the parameters of claim 1. Thus, Macaulay and Hrastar, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest “maintaining a state table on said computer, said state table storing state information for said mobile units, the state information including at least a MAC address parameter, an authentication status parameter, and a further parameter unrelated to the MAC address parameter and the authentication status parameter,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2 and 4-17 depend from, and therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Claim 19, as amended, recites “[i]n a wireless data communications system wherein mobile units communicate with a computer using access points, and wherein said system

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/26401
Ref. No.: 1611

operates according to a protocol specifying a format for data message packets and said data message packets contain state information for said access points, a method for detecting unauthorized access attempts to the system, comprising: forwarding one or more data packets received by said mobile units to a computer; maintaining a state table on said computer, said state table storing state information for said access points, the state information including at least a MAC address parameter, an authentication status parameter, and a further parameter unrelated to the MAC address parameter and the authentication status parameter; and operating said computer to compare format and state information of said one or more received data packets to selected requirements of said protocol-specified format and said stored state information, and signaling an alert if said packets deviate from said protocol-specified format or said stored state information."

The Applicant respectfully submits that Macaulay and Hrastar, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "maintaining a state table on said computer, said state table storing state information for said access points, the state information including at least a MAC address parameter, an authentication status parameter, and a further parameter unrelated to the MAC address parameter and the authentication status parameter," as recited in claim 19, for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 20-23 and 25-35 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.


Attorney Docket No.: 40146/26401

Ref. No.: 1611

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 27, 2008By:
Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276